



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

T-9

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,369	11/26/2003	Hermann Burgmeier	34874-067 UTIL	8023
64280 7590 12/29/2006 MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY & POPEO, P.C. 9255 TOWNE CENTER DRIVE SUITE 600 SAN DIEGO, CA 92121			EXAMINER BELL, CORY C	
			ART UNIT 2164	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE			MAIL DATE	
3 MONTHS			12/29/2006	
			DELIVERY MODE PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/723,369	Applicant(s) BURGMEIER, HERMANN	
	Examiner Cory C. Bell	Art Unit 2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 October 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 October 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 have been considered.

Response to Arguments

1. All arguments presented on 10/02/2006 have been fully considered, and any rejections not repeated have been withdrawn.
2. With regard to applicants arguments that the 102(e) rejections should be withdrawn. The applicant is incorrect. As Liu teaches a database using the broadest reasonable interpretation.

For example the following is a definition found by google:

Definitions of **database** on the Web:

- an organized body of related information
wordnet.princeton.edu/perl/webwn

3. With regard to the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 103 7 and 17-20 the applicant is incorrect as shown above liu does teach the feature as discussed in the 102 rejection above, second Wu is clearly operative to perform mapping between databases in para 4 as excel and XML are databases using the broadest reasonable interpretation, however it is also **expressly disclosed in the paragraphs immediately proceeding the cited paragraph**, paras 5, 6 of Wu. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. Lui teaches having a value mapping table and Wu teaches the interface for searching the table. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

4. Applicants further argument for claim 17 that Wu fails to disclose or suggest “searching for the entry with a search engine to locate the entry in the value mapping table” In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. Lui teaches having a value mapping table and Wu teaches the interface for searching the table. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Lui teaches a mapping table, and Wu teaches the ability to search that table and present the results. It is also noted that WU the table WU is searching in the example is “:storeprocedure:datamap:.”

5. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). **The applicant has failed to make any assertion or provide any evidence that the motivation was from the applicant's reference.** Thus, the examiner motivation is proper.

6. In response to the applicants assertion that there is no reasonable expectation of success. **The applicant fails to provide any reasons to doubt that there would be a reasonable expectation of success.** Thus, the argument is not persuasive.

Art Unit 2164

7. On page 16 of the remarks, applicant refers to the examiner's rejection as being a "rube Goldberg" combination. Applicant is reminded that there is no benefit to be gained from the presentation of remarks which are not factual and objective in nature. Merely attaching a derogatory label to factual evidence presented in the record does not provide the PTO with any basis for consideration of applicant's position on the issues or any basis for consideration of evidence. It also does not provide either applicant or the PTO an opportunity to advance prosecution by clarifying the lines of agreement and disagreement. Any further submission of derogatory labels will not be considered.
8. Applicants further argument for claims 11 and 14 are based on blanket assertions similar to those made for claim 17, and accordingly are not persuasive.

Specification

The amendment filed 10/02/2006 is objected to under 35 USC 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 USC 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material not supported by the disclosure is: The removal of the signal portions from the computer readable medium, which has the effect of expanding the scope of the specification.

Claim Rejections- 35 USC 101

Art Unit: 2164

3. Claims 9-14 are rejected under 35 USC 101 as failing to provide a useful, concrete, and tangible result, as the specifications discloses a machine-readable medium as being a signal with is not tangible.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-6, 8-10, 12, and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 6216131, known hereafter as Liu as shown below.

- 5.1. *As per Claim 1*, Liu teaches: A computer-implemented system comprising: a plurality of databases, each database configured to store at least one domain of objects, {Col 2 lines 56-60} wherein each object is represented by values; {Col 2 lines 60-65 field name or type} a graphical user interface configured to display a table having at least one row and two or more columns, wherein each column represents one of the domains, and the at least one row represents an object common to each domain displayed in the table; {Figure 4} and a mapping engine configured to select a source domain from the plurality of databases, generate a mapping of at least one value from the source domain to another value in at least one target domain from the plurality of

databases based on the object that is common to the at least one value in the source domain and the other value in the at least one target domain, {Col 2 lines 56-65, col 3 lines 2-28} generate the table to represent the mapping {Figure 4} and apply the mapping for a user-initiated change to the table via the graphical user interface. {Figure 3G Synchronize}.

- 5.2. *As per Claim 2, Liu teaches: 2. The computer-implemented system in accordance with claim 1 wherein each row further represents data {Figure 4 shows a representation of data in each row} and the mapping engine is further adapted to map data in the source domain to at least one target domains, {col 10 lines 46-49 teach mapping multiple domains, and col 3 lines 27-29 teaches source to destination} wherein the value comprises a representation of any one of an object and data. {Figure 4}*
- 5.3. *As per Claim 3, Liu teaches: 3. The computer-implemented system in accordance with claim 2 wherein a first value in a first domain is mapped to a second value in a second domain, wherein the first and second values are in the same row of the table, wherein the table is adapted to allow comparisons of a plurality of mapped values in the graphical user interface. {Figure 4}*
- 5.4. *As per Claim 4, Liu teaches: 4. The computer-implemented system in accordance with claim 3 wherein the first value in the first domain has a different representation of the object from the second value in the second domain, wherein the first and second values comprises a relation to the same object. {Figure 4, col 2 lines 56-65}*
- 5.5. *As per Claim 5, Liu teaches: 5. The computer-implemented system in accordance with claim 4 wherein the system is adapted to allow any one of a graphical interface user*

and a program to modify at least one of the plurality of mapped values. {Figure 4 shows a dropdown menu for editing mappings}

- 5.6. *As per Claim 6*, Liu teaches: 6. The computer-implemented system in accordance with claim 5 wherein the computer-implemented system is further adapted to allow any one of a graphical interface user and a program to select a source domain {Figure 5 item 504} and a target domain. {Figure 5 item 505}
- 5.7. *As per Claim 8*, Liu teaches: 8. The computer-implemented system in accordance with claim 4 wherein the software is adapted to allow any one of a graphical interface user and a program to modify at least one mapping between at least two values in the table. {Figure 4}
- 5.8. *As per Claim 9*, Liu teaches: 9. An article comprising a machine-readable medium storing instructions operable to cause a machine to perform operations comprising: presenting a graphical user interface in a display device; presenting a value mapping table in the graphical user interface, the value mapping table comprising one or more columns of domains and one or more rows of values; and presenting values of two or more domains in a side-by-side representation, wherein a first value from a first domain to a second value from a second domain are mapped and share a common row in the value mapping table, wherein each of the one or more rows of values represents an object, {Figure 4, and see claim 1 rejection} and wherein the graphical user interface interacts with a mapping engine that maintains mappings of the first and second values from one or more databases. {Figure 4 dropdown menu, and col 3 lines 20-31}

Art Unit: 2164

- 5.9. *As per Claim 10*, Liu teaches: 10. The article in accordance with claim 9 the operations further comprising: mapping a value between two or more domains; and modifying one or more values in the value mapping table, wherein the mapping engine maintains mappings of values when any one of a value, a column, and a row is modified. {Col 3 lines 20-38}
- 5.10. *As per Claim 12*, Liu teaches: 12. The article in accordance with claim 9 wherein one or more mapping rules are implemented with the value mapping table. {Figure 5 item 505}
- 5.11. *As per Claim 15*, see the rejection of claim 9.
- 5.12. *As per Claim 16*, Liu teaches: 16. The method in accordance with claim 15, further comprising generating a mapping of at least one value from the source domain to a value in at least one target domain for the plurality of databases based on an object that is common to the mapped value in the source and target domains. {Col 2 lines 56-65 and col 3 lines 27-28}

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 7, and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu in view of US 2002/0174098, known hereafter as Wu.

- 7.1. *As per claim 7*, Liu figure 4 teaches one or more mapping being unaltered when one of the plurality of mapped values is modified, because on the mapping containing the changed value is altered. However, Wu teaches being able to reorder rows in para 47 which would inherently have no effect on the mappings as in relational database systems data is not effected by the order of rows or columns. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include this interface as it allows a user to organize data in a manner from which data can be easily interpreted.
- 7.2. *As per claim 17*, Liu teaches having the ability to search using a text field in figure 2B see look for and the binoculars. However, Liu does not expressly disclose being able to use these features to search the value mapping table and displaying the results in the user interface. This feature is taught in Wu figure 12B, which shows a text field that takes in a SQL statement and displays the results below. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the feature of Wu to search the table in Liu, as it provides that ability to narrow results to a desired set and reduces the time required to find desired information.
- 7.3. *As per claim 18*, Liu teaches the claim upon which claim 18 is dependant. However Liu does not expressly disclose receiving a first domain in a text field in the GUI and presenting it to the user, and entering a second domain in a text field a changing the first displayed domain for the second domain. Figure 19 items 22 and 160 in Wu show these features, as the dropdown menu button in item 22 shows the ability to change the domain. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in that art to include this feature as it would allow the user to change the domains in the mapping.

7.4. *As per claim 19*, Lui teaches the claim upon which claim 19 is dependant, but fails to expressly disclose being able to add or delete rows from the mapping table. Wu figure 19, however, show the user having the ability to add or remove fields from the mapping, and thus the mapping table, by being able to check or uncheck fields. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add this feature as it provides that ability to include only those rows necessary for mapping the data sets.

7.5. *As per claim 20*, The table shown in Liu in the previous rejection s displays the domain name and values in the mapping table, however Liu does not expressly disclose using a icon to open the new domain to have the values entered in to the table. This can be seen in figure 15 of Wu in which the user selects an icon to enter a database into the mapping. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use an icon to enter the desired databases domain names and values into the mapping table of Liu, as it provides a visual representation of the domain to the user to improve the ease of usage of an interface.

8. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu in view of Wu in further view of US 6510350, known hereafter as Steen.

8.1. *As per Claim 11*, Liu teaches a system identifying a user (see figure 3A 300a) and the editing steps (Lui See Claim 10 rejection) and Wu teaches login on to data sources see figure 1 . However they don't disclose a user having read only access based on a role. This is taught in col 7 line 66- col 8 line2 of Steen, which teaches a read-only role. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

Art Unit: 2164

invention to designate a user a read-only role for a domain as it would not allow users to edit data that they should not be allowed to edit and making the system more secure.

9. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu in view of US 2003/0014420 known hereafter as Jessee.

9.1. *As per Claim 14*, Liu teaches the claims upon which claim 14 is dependant, but does not expressly disclose the user have the ability to select and reorder rows and columns. This is taught in Jessee para 141. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include these features, as it allows the user to better format data so the it is easier to make deductions from the data.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US 5627979, 5560005, and US 6085196.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2164

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cory C. Bell whose telephone number is (571) 272 2736. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272 4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER